



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/727,258 | 12/03/2003 | Nisheth P. Joshi | M61.12-0563 | 4660 |
| 27366 7590 06/01/2007 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319 | | | EXAMINER TRUONG, CAM Y T | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2162 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 06/01/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,258

Applicant(s)

JOSHI ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T. Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 20 and cancel claim 6 in the amendment filed on 3/9/2007. Claims 1-5, 7-34 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that the combination of cited references does not teach claims 1 and 20 on pages 8-11.

In response to applicant argument,

As to claim 1, Warshavsky teaches a method of migrating business data from a source system to an extensible destination system (col. 4, lines 65-67):

“examining a structural definition of the extensible destination system” as the XML Mapping definition of the XML system consists of three entities; object, Component, and field. The object identifies a specific group of tables and single. The above information shows that the XML Mapping definition of the XML system is examined (col. 3, lines 40-45),

“populating the synchronized intermediate database system with the source data” as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

“migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system” as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

"collecting source data from the source system" as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-5)

Earshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "synchronizing a structure of an intermediate database system with the extensible destination system, wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table".

Krupa teaches converting between a relational database and XML data structure. It enables the storage of an XML document in such a way that: the relational data model would not have to change as the document model changes; the structure of the tables is set up in such a way that the entire document can be retrieved with a single query in a linear (i.e. non-recursive) fashion; and, information about specific individual components within an document can be retrieved via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (Abstract).

Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Krupa's teaching of converting or synchronizing between a relational database with an XML data structure and Nelson teaches extension table to Varshavsky's system in order to provide techniques that would rely on a general data mode for storage that does not change as the object model changes, to fast search information about specific individual components with an XML document via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (abstract, col. 2, lines 35-50) and further allow users to extend

tables in a relational database for storing values or definitions of associated with new attributes in the attribute table.

As to claim 20, Varshavsky teaches claimed limitations:

“providing an intermediate database system” as (col. 4, lines 48-52);

“populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data” as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

“migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system” as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

“collecting source data from the source system” as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-5).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “synchronizing the structure of the intermediate database system with the destination system”.

Krupa teaches converting between a relational database and XML data structure. It enables the storage of an XML document in such a way that: the relational data model would not have to change as the document model changes; the structure of the tables is set up in such a way that the entire document can be retrieved with a single query in a linear (i.e. non-recursive) fashion; and, information about specific individual components within an document can be retrieved via simple queries that do

Art Unit: 2162

not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (Abstract, col. 3, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Krupa's teaching of converting or synchronizing between a relational database with an XML data structure and to Varshavsky's system in order to provide techniques that would rely on a general data mode for storage that does not change as the object model changes, to fast search information about specific individual components with an XML document via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (abstract, col. 2, lines 35-50).

For the above reason, Examiner believed that the cited references teach the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa (US 6915304) and further in view of Nelson (US 6112199).

As to claim 1, Warshavsky teaches a method of migrating business data from a source system to an extensible destination system (col. 4, lines 65-67):

“examining a structural definition of the extensible destination system” as the XML Mapping definition of the XML system consists of three entities; object, Component, and field. The object identifies a specific group of tables and single. The above information shows that the XML Mapping definition of the XML system is examined (col. 3, lines 40-45),

“populating the synchronized intermediate database system with the source data” as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

“migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system” as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

“collecting source data from the source system” as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-5)

Warshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “synchronizing a structure of an intermediate database system with the extensible destination system, wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table”.

Krupa teaches converting between a relational database and XML data structure. It enables the storage of an XML document in such a way that: the relational data model would not have to change as the document model changes; the structure of the

Art Unit: 2162

tables is set up in such a way that the entire document can be retrieved with a single query in a linear (i.e. non-recursive) fashion; and, information about specific individual components within an document can be retrieved via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (Abstract, col. 3, lines 30-35).

Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Krupa's teaching of converting or synchronizing between a relational database with an XML data structure and Nelson teaches extension table to Varshavsky's system in order to provide techniques that would rely on a general data mode for storage that does not change as the object model changes , to provide fast search information about specific individual components with an XML document via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (abstract, col. 2, lines 35-50) and further allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing values or definitions of associated with new attributes in the attribute table.

As to claim 2, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "accessing metadata related to the extensible destination system" as (col. 1, lines 35-50).

As to claim 3, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein synchronizing the structure of the intermediate database system with the extensible destination

system includes invoking an initialization tool” as an XML converter 116 maps the set of relational data to an XML document 104 using the set of XML Mapping definitions constructed for a particular application. The XM converter is represented as an initialization tool (col. 4, lines 65-67).

As to claim 4, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity base table” as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claim 5, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity information table” as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claim 8, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation “wherein migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system is done according to migration overhead information” as (col. 5, lines 10-20; col. 4, lines 40-57).

5. Claims 7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter “Warshavsky”) (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claim 7, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible

Art Unit: 2162

destination system". Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

As to claim 9, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the migration overhead information is user-configurable".

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of UDT to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following user's desire for providing fast and direct access data.

Art Unit: 2162

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and Nelson and further in view of Suver (6016497) and Amborse (US 20020065879) .

As to claim 10, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined software procedures".

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules (paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

11. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and Nelson (US 6112199) and further in view of Lau (6502098).

As to claim 11, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which entities are to be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 12, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about how many entities will be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 13, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data

Art Unit: 2162

transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 14, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 15, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be

Art Unit: 2162

transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 16, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 17, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-55).

As to claim 18, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

Art Unit: 2162

12. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and Nelson (US 6112199) and further in view of Macleod et al (or hereinafter "Macleod") (US 6356901).

As to claim 19, Warshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "SQL server". Macleod teaches SQL server (col. 7, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Macleod teaching of SQL server to Warshavsky's system in order to transfer data in a relational database to another format easily.

13. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa (US 6915304).

As to claim 20, Warshavsky teaches claimed limitations:

"providing an intermediate database system" as (col. 4, lines 48-52);

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data" as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

Art Unit: 2162

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

"collecting source data from the source system" as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-5).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "synchronizing the structure of the intermediate database system with the destination system".

Krupa teaches converting between a relational database and XML data structure. It enables the storage of an XML document in such a way that: the relational data model would not have to change as the document model changes; the structure of the tables is set up in such a way that the entire document can be retrieved with a single query in a linear (i.e. non-recursive) fashion; and, information about specific individual components within an document can be retrieved via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Krupa's teaching of converting or synchronizing between a relational database with an XML data structure and to Varshavsky's system in order to provide techniques that would rely on a general data mode for storage that does not change as the object model changes, to fast search information about specific individual components with an XML document via simple queries that do not require hierarchy traversals or intensive, post-query data parsing (abstract, col. 2, lines 35-50).

As to claim 21, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity base table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claim 22, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity information table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

14. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Nelson (US 6112199).

As to claim 23, Varshavsky does not teach the claimed limitation "the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table". Nelson teaches extension table (col. 6, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to apply Nelson's teaching of extension table to varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

15. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Subramanian and Suver (6016497).

As to claim 24, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible destination system”. Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver’s teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky’s system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

16. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter “Warshavsky”) (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claim 25, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “the migration overhead information is user-configurable”.

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of UDT to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following user's desire for providing fast and direct access data.

17. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Suver (6016497) and Amborse (US 20020065879) .

As to claim 26, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined software procedures".

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules (paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

Art Unit: 2162

18. Claims 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Krupa and further in view of Lau (6502098).

As to claim 27, Warshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which entities are to be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Warshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 28, Warshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about how many entities will be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred

Art Unit: 2162

to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 29, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 30, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 31 Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 32, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 33, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-55).

As to claim 34, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

19. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Egilsson (US 20030023608) .

As to claim 20, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitations:

"providing an intermediate database system" as (col. 4, lines 48-52);

"populating the synchronized intermediate database system with source data" as storing business data in a relational database, the business data includes an employee or a sales order (col. 1, lines 58-59; col. 4, lines 48-52);

"migrating the source data from the intermediate database system to the extensible destination system" as transferring relational data in an XML document over a network (col. 2, lines 40-45).

"collecting source data from the source system" as (col. 1, lines 58-67; col. 2, lines 1-5).

Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "synchronizing the structure of the intermediate database system with the destination system".

Egilsson teaches converting structures into schemas (paragraph 0113, fig. 10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply and to Egilsson teaches converting structures into schemas to Varshavsky's system in order to provide techniques that would rely on a general data mode for storage that does not change as the object model changes, to move data from one structure to another structure faster.

As to claim 21, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity base table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

As to claim 22, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the intermediate database system includes an entity information table" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

20. Claim 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Egilsson further in view of Subramanian et al (or hereinafter "Subramanian") (US 6574631).

As to claim 23, Varshavsky does not teach the claimed limitation "the intermediate database system includes an entity extension table". Subramanian teaches extension table (fig. 6, col. 3, lines 1-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Subramanian's teaching of extension table to

Art Unit: 2162

varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing values or definitions of associated with new attributes in the attribute table.

21. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Egilsson and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claim 25, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the migration overhead information is user-configurable".

Suver teaches user defined type (UDT) (col. 15, lines 35-40). The UDT is represented as user-configurable.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of UDT to Varshavsky's system in order to provide a flexible system so that a user can customize a structure following user's desire for providing fast and direct access data.

22. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Egilsson and further in view of Subramanian and further in view of Suver (6016497).

As to claim 24, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the entity extension table is populated based upon an extension in the extensible destination system". Suver teaches a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When

Art Unit: 2162

the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received. The above information shows the extended table is stored (col. 28, lines 2-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Suver's teaching of a system constructed in accordance as described herein, a user adds all the necessary columns to a single table in the schema. When the user stores data in the table, each row only needs to contain information on the particular test the patient received to Varshavsky's system in order to allow users to extend tables in a relational database for storing data.

23. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Egilsson and further in view of Suver (6016497) and Amborse (US 20020065879) .

As to claim 26, varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein user-configuration is limited to using one or more predefined software procedures".

Amborse teaches customer configuration is limited to customizing business rules (paragraph [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Amborse's teaching of customer configuration is

Art Unit: 2162

limited to customizing business rules to Varshavsky's system in order to greatly reducing the cost and risk of customer application configuration.

24. Claim 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warshavsky et al (or hereinafter "Warshavsky") (US 6732095) in view of Egilsson and further in view of Lau (6502098).

As to claim 27, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which entities are to be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 28, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about how many entities will be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

Art Unit: 2162

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 29, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about which attributes will be migrated".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes attributes that should be to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 30, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order".

Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data

Art Unit: 2162

transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 31, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes information about migration order". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exorting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 32, Varshavsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the EntityMigrationInfor table specifies information about migration for each entities to be migrated". Lau teaches the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes detail information about which records are to be transferred (col. 6, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lau's teaching of the table corresponding to data transfer files. The table includes information in order about which records are to be

Art Unit: 2162

transferred to Varshavsky's system in order to provide for a system for exporting of data in a XML system correctly.

As to claim 33, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein migration overhead information includes an entityAttribute table" as (col. 6, lines 40-55).

As to claim 34, Varshavsky teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the migration overhead information is stored as part of the intermediate database" as (col. 6, lines 55-67).

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162